Single Bench

(3)

9/4/2004

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, AT-BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 4787 OF 2004

BETWEEN

PETITIONERS : 1. G. P. DUBEY
AGED – 61 YEARS
SON OF LATE S. P. DUBEY
R/O – BRAHMAN PARA, WARD NO. 58
HOUSE NO. 358, RAIPUR
DISTRICT – RAIPUR (C.G.)

4784/04
P.R. No. ...
Presented by ... R.K. Kashyap
dated 07-12-04

2. CHAIT RAM YADU,
AGED - 58 YEARS
SON OF MEHATTAR RAM YADU
R/O DAGANYA, RAIPUR (C.G.)
DISTRICT – RAIPUR (C.G.)

3. SMT. M. DIWAN,
AGED - 57 YEARS
WIFE OF SHRI BANSHIDHAR DIWAN
R/O – NEAR SAI MANDIR,
MAHADEVGHAT, RAIPURA,
DISTRICT – RAIPUR (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
7/12/04
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

4. SMT. SUCHITA DUBEY
AGED - 53 YEARS
WIFE OF SHRI NARENDRA DUBEY
R/O – D/27, TAIGORE NAGAR, RAIPUR
DISTRICT – RAIPUR (C.G.)

ALL THE PETITIONERS ARE WORKING AS - ASSISTANT TEACHERS, AT – GOVT. J.R.DANI GIRLS HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, RAIPUR (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH
THROUGH – THE SECRETARY
SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
MANTRALAYA D.K.S. BHAWAN,
RAIPUR.

ADVOCATE
BIDDENDU NAG
14/14/03
1-03

2.. THE DIRECTOR,
PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
CHHATTISGARH, RAIPUR

3. DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER,
AT – RAIPUR (C.G.)

...2...

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE- 226 & 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(29)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 4787/04 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

23.9.2005

Shri R. K. Kesharwani, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Arun Sao, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the respondents.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been working as Assistant Teacher and have completed 24 years regular service. The petitioners are entitled to second time bond promotion but they have not been granted the same, which is contrary to the provisions of the Circular dated 17.3.2004 (Annexure P/2), 17th March 1999/19.4.1999 (Annexure P/3), 4th April, 2000 (Annexure P/4), 19th April, 2000 (Annexure P/5), 2nd May, 2002 (Annexure P/6) and 14th January, 2003 (Annexure P/7).

Learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute the aforestated submission made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the aforesaid documents, the petition is allowed and the concerned District Education Officer is directed to consider the case of the petitioners, in accordance with the above stated circulars, for grant of second time bond promotion. No order as to costs.

Certified copy, as per Rules.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

SP/FS/2005 - 20,000